



# THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### Reframing Scripture

**Citation for published version:**

Adams, S 2013, Reframing Scripture: A Fresh Look at Baruch's So-Called "Citations". in GG Xeravits, T Nicklas & I Kalimi (eds), *Scriptural Authority in Early Judaism and Ancient Christianity* . Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies, no. 16, Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin, pp. 63-84.

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

**Published In:**

Scriptural Authority in Early Judaism and Ancient Christianity

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

© Adams, S. (2013). Reframing Scripture: A Fresh Look at Baruch's So-Called "Citations". In G. G. Xeravits, T. Nicklas, & I. Kalimi (Eds.), *Scriptural Authority in Early Judaism and Ancient Christianity* . (pp. 63-84). (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies; 16). Berlin: De Gruyter.

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# Reframing Scripture: A Fresh Look at Baruch's So-Called "Citations"

SEAN A. ADAMS

## Introduction

Many papers could and have been written on Baruch's use of Israel's Scripture. Not only do the Jewish Scriptures strongly influence Baruch in literary and linguistic selections, but some scholars have argued that Baruch is just a "pastiche" of Scriptural references in which the author "string[s] together passages borrowed or adapted from canonical sources".<sup>1</sup> Although I disagree with some of the pejorative terms used to describe Baruch in the past, it is clear with any reading of Baruch that this work is heavily influenced and draws repeatedly on Jewish Scripture.

The impetus for this article arose when I was investigating intertextuality in Bar 1:15-3:8 at which time I became disturbed by the lack of terminological precision and nuance scholars used when discussing the way Baruch uses scripture.<sup>2</sup> This, I believe, has led to a confusion of meaning and an overstating of positions. Tackling the entire issue of intertextuality in Bar 1:15-3:8 would far outstrip the word limitations of this article. Accordingly, in this article I will focus on the so-called "quotations" in Baruch's penitential prayer section. After providing a brief introduction to some important preliminary issues, including a small section to discuss terminology, the bulk of the

---

<sup>1</sup> BURKE, *Poetry of Baruch*, 21.

<sup>2</sup> There are a number of compositional theories of Baruch, though I am inclined to follow the view of STECK (*Das Apokryphe Baruchbuch*, 265), who has argued that the different parts of Baruch form an intentional unity. We also do not know who wrote/compiled Baruch, although we are quite sure that it was not Baruch ben Nariah, but for convenience this paper will use Baruch when referring to the author(s) of the Book of Baruch. For a more thorough discussion of group authorship, see STECK, *Das Apokryphe Baruchbuch*, 306-307.

paper will look at Baruch's four so-called "quotations". Here I will argue that Baruch makes use of the deuteronomic tradition to frame the penitential prayer, but through a Jeremianic frame. In this I will primarily respond to Watson's recent proposal. Finally, we will look at the rhetorical significance of using quotation formulas and how they function in Baruch.

### Text of Baruch

There are no extant texts of Baruch in Hebrew. This, however, has not stopped scholars from positing a Hebrew original, at least for certain sections.<sup>3</sup> The first and most notable retroversion was attempted by J.J. Kneucker, whose textual work and study of Baruch translations have laid the foundation for Baruchan study.<sup>4</sup> More recently, E. Tov has provided a retroversion of Baruch 1:1-3:8, holding the view that the remainder of Baruch lacks sufficient evidence for either a Hebrew original or sufficient data to create a Hebrew text with confidence.<sup>5</sup> Despite this caution by Tov, D.G. Burke has provided a reconstruction of the "original" Hebrew text of 3:9-5:9.<sup>6</sup>

Although these attempts at reconstructing the Hebrew behind the Greek Septuagint version are interesting, the enterprise of retroverting a text has recently been called into question.<sup>7</sup> In his article, "(How) Can We Tell if a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon has been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?," Jim Davila thoroughly problematises the enterprise of retroversion by highlighting the retroverter's ignorance of key textual issues, such as: difficulties in determining Greek from Semitic grammar; possible language and dialect of origin, and the inadequacy of the bipolar scale of "literal" vs. "free" translation technique. Furthermore, Davila questions whether or not we can even securely establish Semitic interference.

Our ability to do such retroversion is further hampered in light of James Barr's insightful questioning of what the term "literal" means in

---

<sup>3</sup> TORRY, *The Apocryphal Literature*, 62.

<sup>4</sup> KNEUCKER, *Das Buch Baruch*.

<sup>5</sup> TOV, *The Book of Baruch*.

<sup>6</sup> BURKE, *The Poetry of Baruch*.

<sup>7</sup> DAVILA, (How) Can We Tell, 3-61.

respect to translations.<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, that a number of scholars see Hebrew structure and influence behind the Greek provides insight in to understanding the Greek language of Baruch. This, however, is likely due to the Hebrew influence on the LXX which influenced the author(s) of Baruch. This perspective suffices sufficiently as an explanation for the Greek style of Baruch and undermines the need to postulate a Hebrew *Vorlage*.

In light of this understanding and Davila's critique, I will be making use solely of the existing Greek text of Baruch and will not consult or interact with various retroversions. Furthermore, as we will be discussing below, the relationship and parallels between Baruch and the Jewish Scriptures in Greek suggests that the author of Baruch was drawing on Greek texts for his composition. Consequently, unless otherwise specified, all references are to the Greek, rather than the Hebrew, text.

### Definitions of "Citation"

One of the first challenges of interpreting Baruch, particularly in this study, is adequately defining the terms and concepts of citation, allusion, etc.<sup>9</sup> Although scholarship is moving towards a greater definitional consensus, it is apparent that further work is still needed. Clearly, comprehensive definitions to each of these categories would require extended treatments well beyond the limits of this present study. Issues relating to definitions are complex, touching on numerous and often nuanced subtleties. The goal pursued in this article is much more modest, seeking to look more comprehensively at Baruch's so-called "citations". This investigation will commence with a brief

---

<sup>8</sup> BARR, *The Typology of Literalism*.

<sup>9</sup> Some scholars, such as Hammill, have attempted to evaluate citation techniques in Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal works. Hammill does rightly discern between quotations in which interpretation is involved and quotations which are "only convenient literary phrases which the author has taken over, or had become idioms or clichés in common use among the people" (p. 16 n.1). However, in his attempt to distinguish "acceptable" and "unacceptable" interpretation (pp. 52-131), Hammill imposes modern criteria on ancient practices. HAMMILL, *Biblical Interpretation*. For a further discussion of Hammill's work, see SCHULTZ, *The Search for Quotation*, 146-149.

discussion of this term before turning our attention to specific textual examples.

The primary definition needed for this study is that of citation. One of the challenges in dealing with Baruch and other “apocryphal” and “pseudepigraphal” literature is that there are few explicit quotations.<sup>10</sup> Echoes abound, but citations are in short supply. Christopher Stanley has attempted to delineate the existence of a citation in terms of either a “reader-centered” or an “author-centered” approach.<sup>11</sup> In the former, a passage can only be labelled a citation when it provides the reader with at least some indication that a quotation is present. In the latter approach, any verse that exhibits substantial verbal agreement with a known passage of Scripture, whether marked or not, can be classified as a “citation”. What the reader-centered approach gains in conservatism, it loses in number of examples. Conversely, the author-centered approach is much more encompassing and allows for a more diverse handling of the texts, but runs the risk of including heterogeneous examples.

In light of this challenge, Dieter-Alex Koch has proposed a methodologically concise way of identifying citations from a reader’s perspective.<sup>12</sup> Here Koch describes seven conditions under which a statement (in his case Pauline) might legitimately be identified as a quotation: (1) when accompanied by a clear formula; (2) when the same words appear in another context where they are marked clearly as a citation; (3) when followed by an interpretive gloss; (4) when the words in question stand out syntactically from their (Pauline) context; (5) when the passage differs stylistically from the verses that surround it; (6) when introduced by a light particle of emphasis; and (7) when the verse reproduces a tradition that the author clearly assumes will be familiar to his readers.<sup>13</sup>

Koch’s conditions help provide a more robust methodology for identifying and labelling quotations within a particular author. There

<sup>10</sup> STANLEY, Paul and the Language of Scripture, 308-309.

<sup>11</sup> STANLEY, Paul and the Language of Scripture, 34.

<sup>12</sup> KOCH, Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums, 11-15.

<sup>13</sup> KOCH, Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums, 13-15. Challenging many of the above criteria, Stanley only adheres to categories 1, 3, and 4 of Koch. STANLEY, Paul and the Language of Scripture, 36-37. A similar approach was previously advanced by FOX, The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature, 416-31.

are, however, some limitations. For example, condition seven is much more subjective than condition one, which provides a clear criterion for evaluation. Moreover, certain conditions (e.g., two, four, and seven) rely on sufficient knowledge of the author in question. This is problematic for authors that have a limited corpus from which to draw, such as Baruch. As a result, this article will only use the first of Koch's conditions: "accompanied by a clear formula".<sup>14</sup> This is not to suggest that other means of determining citations cannot or should not be applied to Baruch. Rather, this article will solely focus on Baruch's explicit citations in which named source (Moses or "Prophets") is given.

Unfortunately, this type of definitional rigour has been absent from many studies of Baruch. For example, Emanuel Tov in his work comparing Baruch to LXX Jeremiah regularly uses the terms "citation" and "quotation" to indicate a wide range of textual relationships. In many of these cases Tov merely wishes to identify textual inspiration and errs in labelling a one-word overlap as a quotation.<sup>15</sup>

One of the additional challenges of investigating Baruch's use of scripture is securely determining and identifying passages in which Baruch appropriates a LXX text. Not only is identifying which text Baruch cited a potential problem, but identifying the textual tradition(s) available to him is nearly impossible.<sup>16</sup> As a result, the commentator of Baruch is left making suggestions of source verses, which might have influenced the author of Baruch: "The greater part of Bar(uch) is a

---

<sup>14</sup> This is also the methodology adopted by STANLEY, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*.

<sup>15</sup> For a list of examples, see TOV, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*, 122-124.

<sup>16</sup> STANLEY, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 293. Stanley's summarises further issues: "Several explanations can be posited for this comparative neglect: the complex and uncertain text-history of the biblical materials themselves; the difficulty in fixing an individual author's biblical *Vorlage*; the loss of original language versions of many of the works in question; a notable lack of comparative studies on other documents; and especially the higher visibility and relative accessibility of an author's exegetical techniques as compared to the way he handled the wording of Scripture. Comparing hermeneutical models is certainly a more promising enterprise than entering into a labyrinthine discussion of the relationship between a series of quotations and their presumed biblical *Vorlage*. In the long run, however, there is no escaping the close analysis that is required to render an adequate portrait of an author's approach to the biblical text."

mosaic of biblical passages; it quotes or elaborates upon many biblical phrases, sentences and sections...<sup>17</sup> Though this article will not avoid the discussion of intertextual references in the “citations” —they will be an important focus—our investigation will not end there. Rather it will look to determine how Scripture is holistically used in Baruch through the use of citation formulae.

### “Citations” in Baruch

Turning to the penitential text of Baruch (1:15-3:8), it appears that there are four passages that meet Koch’s first criterion: Bar 2:2, 20, 24, and 28. Although we will only be discussing the four instances in which it appears that Baruch claims to be explicitly citing Jewish Scripture, it will be apparent that these passages are not exact citations so coveted and required by modern scholarship. Rather, it will be shown that they are mostly composite in character, drawing from a variety of sources. These sources, however, are not randomly selected. On the contrary, they are compiled and filtered in a way that channels the reader’s interpretation through a Jeremican frame.

#### Baruch 2:2-3

The first example of a “citation” in Baruch occurs at 2:2, which contains the phrase “according to that which is written in the Law of Moses” (κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσῆ), which appears to introduce a specific quotation: “that we should eat, a person the flesh of his son and a person the flesh of his daughter” (τοῦ φαγεῖν ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπον σάρκα υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπον σάρκα θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ, Bar 2:3).

Upon inspection of the books of Moses it becomes apparent that this promise of cannibalizing of children is present, not only in the book of Deuteronomy and its lists of curses (Deut 28:53), “Then you shall eat the offspring of your own body, the flesh of your sons and of your daughters whom the LORD your God has given you, during the siege and the distress by which your enemy shall oppress you” (καὶ φάγη τὰ ἔκγονα τῆς κοιλίας σου κρέα υἱῶν σου καὶ θυγατέρων σου ὅσα

<sup>17</sup> Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*, 125-126.

ἔδωκέν σοι κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἐν τῇ στενοχωρίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν τῇ θλίψει σου ἣ θλίψει σε ὁ ἐχθρός σου), but also in Lev 26:29 “You will eat the flesh of your sons and the flesh of your daughters” (καὶ φάγεσθε τὰς σάρκας τῶν υἱῶν ὑμῶν καὶ τὰς σάρκας τῶν θυγατέρων ὑμῶν φάγεσθε).<sup>18</sup>

Outside of the Pentateuch, there are a couple references to eating one's own flesh. Isaiah 9:20 states that the Lord will be against Israel and that each person will eat the flesh of his own arms, both right and left, but will still be hungry. However, the best parallel outside the Mosaic Law for Bar 2:3 would clearly be Jer 19:9. In the passage leading up to this verse, Israel has once again failed to heed the word of the Lord. As a result, the Lord promises that he will punish Jerusalem by the sword. The climax of this curse is Jer 19:9, “And they will eat the flesh of their sons, and the flesh of their daughters; and they will eat every one the flesh of his neighbour in the blockade, and in the siege which their enemies will besiege them” (καὶ ἔδονται τὰς σάρκας τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς σάρκας τῶν θυγατέρων αὐτῶν καὶ ἕκαστος τὰς σάρκας τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ ἔδονται ἐν τῇ περισχῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ πολιορκίᾳ ἣ πολιορκήσουσιν αὐτοὺς οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν) (cf. Lam 2:20; 4:10; Ezek 5:10; 2 Kgs 6:28-29).

Although there is a change of person from second person to first person in Baruch, as well as a difference in number and construction, it is apparent that Lev 26:29 is the best fit for the reference in Bar 2:3, particularly in light of Baruch's explicit reference of the Law of Moses. The observant reader, however, would not only note this key Mosaic passage, but also pick up the allusive reference to Jeremiah. Similar to the Leviticus parallel, Jer 9:19 also changes the person reference (third to first person) and uses the plural as opposed to the singular when referencing sons and daughters.

On the other hand, the Jeremiah passage, unlike Leviticus, shares the same referent as Baruch, Jerusalem (Bar 2:2; Jer 19:3), and explicitly situates this punishing event in the Jewish capital: “It was not done under all of heaven as he did in Jerusalem” (οὐκ ἐποιήθη ὑποκάτω παντὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καθὰ ἐποίησεν ἐν Ιερουσαλημ, Bar 2:2). The role

<sup>18</sup> Unfortunately this reference to the Law of Moses and the possible allusion to Deuteronomy is not discussed in length by MARTILA, *Deuteronomistic Ideology and Phraseology in the Book of Baruch*, 327.



of Jerusalem is prominent in Baruch, particularly in the final section of Baruch where Jerusalem has an extended speaking role (4:8-5:9). Similarly, the opening of Baruch (1:1-14) sets Jerusalem as the geographic destination of the work. Although not it the quotation itself, Baruch's framing of the quotation with a reference to Jerusalem in 2:2 helps the reader interpret the quotation and draw the parallels from Jeremiah 19. This explicit geographical referent is too important to overlook and provides the framework for understanding Baruch's "citation".

Rodney A. Werline has put forward an alternate view to interpret this passage, claiming that Baruch's penitential prayer section is thoroughly dependent on Daniel 9. According to Werline, at the time at which the author wrote Baruch (following the Jewish victories over the Seleucid armies)<sup>19</sup> the temple was no longer profaned as it was in Daniel. "To compensate for this, he incorporates an account of cannibalism during Antiochus V's siege."<sup>20</sup> This citation of Moses, according to Werline, is then inserted by Baruch into Daniel's invoking of the Mosaic Law in Dan 9:11. The major difference is that the author of Baruch changed Daniel's "we sinned against him" into an account of cannibalism.

The relationship between Daniel and Baruch in the penitential prayer section is complex. Many authors have attempted to discern exactly what is going on between these two works, and their arguments are not able to be discussed in full here.<sup>21</sup> Although I am not entirely convinced of Werline's reading of Baruch in light of the events and reign of Antiochus V, I appreciate Werline's discussion of penitential parallels between Baruch and Daniel and his attempt to incorporate the importance of Jeremiah for Baruch. In particular, Werline identifies Baruch's continued use of Jeremiah and Deuteronomy and how both

---

<sup>19</sup> Werline follows Goldstein for his dating of Baruch. WERLINE, *Penitential Prayer*, 87; GOLDSTEIN, *The Apocryphal Book of I Baruch*, 179-199. For other dating views, see BURKE, *Poetry of Baruch*, 26-28.

<sup>20</sup> WERLINE, *Penitential Prayer*, 96.

<sup>21</sup> For further consideration, see WAMBACQ, *Les prieres de Baruch*, 463-475; MOORE, *Toward the Dating of the Book of Baruch*, 312-320; TOV, *The Relation between the Greek Versions*, 27-34.

are important for understanding Baruch's message.<sup>22</sup> This is especially the case as Baruch intentionally inserted a "citation" from the Law of Moses which has a strong parallel in Jeremiah.

As a result, though it is clear that Baruch is invoking the Mosaic tradition and his prophetic curse, it is not possible to disassociate the Baruch passage from its Jeremianic parallel. Nor is this what the author intended. Here in Bar 2:3 we have the fulfillment of the prophetic announcement by both Moses and Jeremiah. The specific geographic referent, Jerusalem, supplied by Jeremiah and understandably absent in Leviticus and Deuteronomy, guides the observant reader to interpret this Mosaic reference through the lens of Jeremiah. As we will soon see, Baruch's method of reframing the Mosaic tradition through Jeremiah is a recurring pattern.

#### Baruch 2:20-23

Continuing through the penitential prayer section, there are three other passages in Baruch (2:20, 24-28) whose citation technique adheres to Koch's category one in which there is an explicit citation formula. Additionally, Baruch also provides a referent along with a corresponding citation phrase, in the case of Bar 2:20 it is λέγων "saying". What follows in each passage is a conglomeration of verses from different sources that have been arranged into a single quotation. In each case the language of the original verses has been so thoroughly adapted by the author to fit his literary agenda that, despite his identification of an author, determining the identity and location of the verses behind the quote is challenging.

It is interesting to note that at least one ancient reader possibly did not see this as a quotation. In the critical edition of the *Septuaginta* by Rahlfs-Hanhart Bar 2:20 reads καθάπερ ἐλάλησας ἐν χειρὶ τῶν παίδων σου τῶν προφητῶν λέγων. However, in both codex Vaticanus and the Syro-Hexaplar the "saying" (λέγων) is absent. Although this omission in Vaticanus could be explained by *homoioteleuton*, the scribe skipping over λέγων because it shares the same ending as προφητῶν,

---

<sup>22</sup> For example, Werline has a much more explicit and coherent integration of Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Baruch than MOORE, Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah; and KNEUCHER, Das Buch Baruch.

it is possible that the scribe recognised that this was not an actual quotation from one of the prophets and dropped the signalling λέγων.<sup>23</sup>

Baruch 2:20, references un-named prophets, “just as you said through the hand of your servants the prophets, saying...” (καθάπερ ἐλάλησας ἐν χειρὶ τῶν παίδων σου τῶν προφητῶν λέγων)

For you have brought your anger and your wrath against us, as you had spoken by the hand of your servants the prophets, saying: “Thus did the Lord say: ‘Incline your shoulder, and work for the king of Babylon, and sit upon the land which I gave to your fathers. And if you do not obey the voice of the Lord to work for the king of Babylon, I will make to fail from the towns of Judah and from outside Jerusalem a voice of merriment and a voice of delight, a voice of bridegroom and a voice of bride, and all the land will become untrodden by inhabitants’” (Bar 2:20-23).

Although there is an explicit reference to the prophets, which prophet(s) Baruch is intending is obscure. However, upon closer inspection Baruch seems to be only paraphrasing one prophet, Jeremiah.<sup>24</sup> For example, Zink claims that Baruch combines Jer 27[34]:11-14 and 7:34 to form this passage.<sup>25</sup> Moore follows by affirming the references of Jer 27[34]:11-12 and 7:34, but also adds Jer 16:9; 33:10-11.<sup>26</sup> Stanley endorses the identification of Jer 27:11-14, but challenges the reference of 7:34, seeing instead Jer 33:10-11 and 34:22b.<sup>27</sup> Recently, Večho has attempted to advance our understanding and agrees that this “quotation” is drawn from Jeremiah. However, she identifies a much larger number of parallel texts claiming that Baruch has drawn from every part of Jeremiah.<sup>28</sup> This strong emphasis on Jeremiah

<sup>23</sup> The scribe of Vaticanus was quite conscientious and careful with his copying. Furthermore, the corrector was quite thorough in catching the few mistakes. As a result, the λέγων might have been previously omitted and the scribe of Vaticanus faithfully copied his exemplar. Either way, the fact that a good manuscript omits λέγων here is interesting and may suggest more than an accidental slip of the eye.

<sup>24</sup> The references to the King of Babylon in Ezekiel are in warning to Israel and lack specific parallels.

<sup>25</sup> ZINK, *The Use of the Old Testament in the Apocrypha*, 109-113. WHITEHOUSE (Baruch, 586) also notes the influence of Jer 27:11-12, but also adds Jer 29:5f, 7:34, 16:9, and 33:10-11.

<sup>26</sup> MOORE, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah*, 288.

<sup>27</sup> STANLEY, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 310.

<sup>28</sup> VEČHO, *There is Hope for the Scattered People*, 90. Večho’s identification of (MT) Jeremiah passages in Bar 2:21-23: v. 21a // Jer 27:4,7f.,10f.,12f.; v. 21b // Jer 35:15; 25:5;

reinforces the Jeremianic perspective developed in this section and strengthens the ties between Jeremiah and Baruch.<sup>29</sup>

One issue with only being able to identify Jeremianic parallels in this Baruch “quotation” is the reference to multiple prophets (2:20). Although this is not the first time Baruch has referred to prophets in the plural (1:21), it is the first time that a saying has been attributed to them. A parallel example, however, also occurs in 2:24 (to be discussed below). Nevertheless, to anticipate that discussion, Bar 2:24 also primarily references Jeremiah despite the plural form of prophets. Nowhere in Baruch is a specific prophet referenced by name despite the abundance of intertextual parallels. The only author referenced by name is Moses (1:20; 2:2, 28). The paired references to Moses and the prophets in the penitential prayer section fit well with Baruch’s holistic vision of the history of Israel and her ongoing relationship with God.<sup>30</sup> Not only does the author of Baruch remind the reader of God’s promises with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (2:34), but he recalls God’s repeated messages given through the prophets as a warning and promise of discipline.

Within Jewish Scripture it was not only Jeremiah who warned the people of Israel about God’s impending judgement and exile, although he is arguably the most memorable voice. Rather, the prophets are seen as a chorus of voices warning the people of waywardness and trying to re-establish right actions and beliefs. As a result, it is possible that Baruch was attempting to bring the combined weight of the prophets to support his specific statements drawn from Jeremiah. In this way, Baruch’s Jeremianic development of the “prophets” shapes the way that the reader views the prophets’s message.

---

v. 22 // Jer 26:4; 3:25; 7:24-28; 9:11-12; 11:4-5; 26:12-13; 32:23; 38:20; 42:13,21-22; 44:23; v. 23 // Jer 7:34; 16:9(-13); 25:10-11; 25:38; 26:9; 34:22; 33:10-11.

<sup>29</sup> There is substantial scholarly discussion regarding the relationship between Baruch and Jeremiah (LXX). One of the more influential perspectives is that of E. TOV (The Book of Baruch; The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch) in which he argues that there was a similar translator/redactor used for Jer 29-52 (Jer B') and Baruch 1:1-3:9. Although this perspective is still accepted by a number of scholars, there is a growing awareness of the problems undermining Tov’s perspective. I think that there is a much more dynamic use of Jeremiah by the author(s) of Baruch that cannot be limited to a similar redactor.

<sup>30</sup> KABASELE MUKENGE, Les Citations Internes en *Ba.* 1,15-3,8, 215.

Baruch is not the only writer to make use of the “prophets” to support a claim despite not citing multiple prophets. For example, Ezra 9:11-12 speaks of a command from the prophets, but it is not to be found in the prophetic corpus. J.M. Myers in his commentaries claims that these verses are “a general summation of the message of the prophets”<sup>31</sup> and that “verses 11 and 12 represent a patchwork of Mosaic and prophetic ideas brought together by the writer.”<sup>32</sup> H.G.M. Williamson also notes that “the citation does not come from a single passage, but is rather a mosaic of many passages and scriptural allusions.” This, he claims, “is understandable in a liturgical context, but also is of significance as a pointer to the emergence of a view which came to regard Scripture as a uniform authority.”<sup>33</sup>

Similarly, although writing somewhat later, Matthew 2:23 makes a parallel claim, “So was fulfilled what was said through the prophets: ‘He will be called a Nazarene’.” Here, however, commentators have only found one possible referent, Isaiah, though there have been a number of theories proposed to answer this issue. R.T. France argues that Matthew is not providing a quotation from a specific passage, but is invoking the general theme of prophecy.<sup>34</sup> Others, such as U. Luz, suggest that Matthew used “prophets” because could not remember the exact location to cite the correct prophet by name.<sup>35</sup> Although this latter view is possible for Matthew, it is unlikely for Baruch whose work is so thoroughly influenced by Jeremiah that it would be difficult to argue that he forgot where these verses came from. W.D. Davies and D.C. Allison have posited that Matthew used “prophets” to signal that he was not going to cite scripture verbatim and that the reader should expect something else.<sup>36</sup>

A number of the theories given by commentators of Ezra and Matthew parallel what is happening in Baruch. Not only is there a patchwork of verses recalled in Baruch, but it appears that the author is intentionally developing a wide interpretive lens by which he wants the reader to approach Bar 2:20-23. This passage and the invoking of

---

<sup>31</sup> MYERS, I and II Esdras, 93.

<sup>32</sup> MYERS, Ezra, Nehemiah, 79.

<sup>33</sup> WILLIAMSON, Ezra, Nehemiah. 137.

<sup>34</sup> FRANCE, Matthew, 91.

<sup>35</sup> LUZ, Matthew 1-7, 123.

<sup>36</sup> DAVIES/ALLISON, Matthew 1-7, 174-175.

the “prophets”, if seen in tandem with the other “citations”, works well for Baruch’s overall view of the unity of Scripture. Baruch not only wants Jeremiah, but the entire corpus of the prophets to bear witness to what has happened to the people of Israel. This perspective will be further developed below.

#### Baruch 2:24

The short citation at Bar 2:24, though missing λέγων or ὅτι to indicate a direct quotation, still fulfils Koch’s criterion of citation as it explicitly references the words that the Lord spoke through his the prophets, “And we did not listen to your voice to work for the king of Babylon, and you have established your words, which you spoke by the hand of your servants the prophets”. The words purported to be from the prophets include a promise that “the bones of our kings and the bones of our father would be carried out from their places”. The omission of a direct speech marker, though not obscuring the invocation of the prophets, minimises the strength of the quotation and opens a greater possibility that the words following are not a direct quotation.

As with Bar 2:20-23 above, Baruch does not specify which prophet(s) he is referring to, but once again the closest text comes from Jeremiah. Here the best parallel is Jer 8:1 which says “At that time, says the Lord, they shall bring the bones of the kings of Judah and the bones of its rulers and the bones of the priests and the bones of the prophets and the bones of the inhabitants of Jerusalem out of their tombs...”

The similarities between these two texts were seen by some of the ancients as is indicated by Codex Alexandrinus (along with the Arabic text tradition), which makes an addition to Bar 2:24 to include more of Jer 8:1, specifically, καὶ τὰ ὅσα τῶν ἀρχόντων ἡμῶν. Similarly, most modern scholars would agree that Jer 8:1 is the best fit for this verse. For example, Kabasele Mukenge identifies this as an “indirect citation” of Jer 8:1.<sup>37</sup> Although Kabasele Mukenge does an admirable job of discussing the differences between these two passage and the possible redactions that Bar 2:24 might have undergone, he does not adequately discuss the function of this verse, particularly Baruch’s use of the plural

---

<sup>37</sup> Kabasele Mukenge, *Les Citations Internes en Ba.* 1,15-3,8, 216.

prophets to reference only Jeremiah.<sup>38</sup> As mentioned above, it is clear from even a cursory study of Baruch that Jeremiah exerts much influence on the narrative. As a result, claiming that the author of Baruch did not know where this passage came from because he was drawing from memory is unconvincing. Rather, it is more likely that the author of Baruch knew that this was a reference to Jeremiah, but wanted to invoke the whole of the prophetic corpus.

#### Baruch 2:28-35

The final citation of this section, Bar 2:28-35, identifies Moses by name and provides a specific narrative context (καθὰ ἐλάλησας ἐν χειρὶ παιδός σου Μωυσῆ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐντειλαμένου σου αὐτῷ γράψαι τὸν νόμον σου ἐναντίον υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ λέγων).

As you spoke by the hand of your servant Moses in the day when you commanded him to write your law before the sons of Israel, saying: "If you do not obey my voice, surely this great, voluminous buzzing will turn into a small one among the nations, there where I will scatter them. For I knew that they would not obey me, because the people are stiff-necked. And they will return to their heart in the land of their exile, and they will know that I am the Lord their God. And I will give them a heart and hearing ears, and they will praise me in the land of their exile, and they will remember my name, and they will turn away from their hard back and from their wicked deeds, because they will remember the way of their fathers who sinned before the Lord. And I will return them to the land, which I swore to their fathers, to Abraham and to Isaac and to Jacob, and they will rule over it, and I will multiply them, and they will not diminish. I will establish with them an everlasting covenant, that I be God to them and they be a people to me, and I will not disturb them again, my people Israel, from the land that I have given them" (Bar 2:28-35).

Here we find another supposed quotation that fits Koch's criteria. However, unlike the previous examples, this passage does not have a direct correspondent in Torah.<sup>39</sup> Furthermore, unlike Bar 2:21-23 which reworks only Jeremiah, this "quotation" draws from a number of biblical books. Zink identifies the influences of Lev 26:12; 1 Kgs 8:47; Jer

<sup>38</sup> Kabasele Mukenge, *Les Citations Internes en Ba.* 1,15-3,8, 219-223.

<sup>39</sup> KABASELE MUKENGE (*Les Citations Internes en Ba.* 1,15-3,8, 215-216) wants to differentiate between the different quotations by the use of "writing" or "saying" vocabulary. I am not convinced that this strong division can be made to indicate the author's direct use of citation or paraphrase.

16:15b; Gen 50:24b; and Jer 31:31, 33.<sup>40</sup> Stanley has made some further suggestions for this composite, indicating parallels between this passage and Jer 32:37-41, 29:6, and Deut 30:20.<sup>41</sup> Whitehouse identifies Deut 27:62; 1 Kgs 8:47; Deut 6:10, Jer 19:6b; 31:31; 32:40,<sup>42</sup> whereas Večho once again see numerous parallels primarily drawn from Deuteronomy and Jeremiah.<sup>43</sup>

Francis Watson, however, is much more specific, suggesting that Bar 2:27-35 is a “free paraphrase of Deuteronomy 30.1-10,” most likely based on Baruch’s specific temporal reference, namely that “Baruch has in mind the depiction of a future beyond the curse in Deuteronomy 30.1-10.”<sup>44</sup> Watson, furthermore, argues that Baruch is best understood as an elaboration of the deuteronomic schema,<sup>45</sup> identifying a number of instances where Baruch appears to be drawing on Deuteronomy and noting that these passages are pivotal for understanding Baruch’s view of Israel. For example, in the beginning of this section (1:15-3:8), following an acknowledgement of guilt, Watson claims that Baruch frames the history of Israel as a history of disobedience:

From the day when the Lord brought our fathers out of the land of Egypt even until this day, we were being disobedient to the Lord our God, and we were acting carelessly so as not to listen to his voice. And there have clung to us the bad things and the curse (τὰ κακὰ καὶ ἡ ἀρά) that the Lord instructed to his servant Moses in the day he brought out our ancestors from the land of Egypt, to give to us a land flowing with milk and honey, as this day... (Bar 1:19-21).

From the explicit reference to Moses and the curse given after the exodus, it is clear that Baruch is referencing Deuteronomy. Watson, however, states the “curse” here is the curse of Deuteronomy 27:26: “Cursed be every person who does not remain in all the words of this

<sup>40</sup> ZINK, *The Use of the Old Testament in the Apocrypha*, 109-113.

<sup>41</sup> STANLEY, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 310.

<sup>42</sup> WHITEHOUSE, *Baruch*, 586.

<sup>43</sup> VEČHO, *There is Hope for the Scattered People*, 92 n.45. The text is a mosaic of quotations from: v. 29 // Deut 28:15; Jer 26:4; Deut 4:27; 28:62; Jer 42:2; v. 30 // Deut 31:27-29; Jer 7:26-27; 17:23; 30:10; 46:27; v. 31 // Deut 4:39; Jer 24:7; Deut 29:3; Jer 24:7; 32:39; v. 33 // Deut 31:27; 2 Kings 17:14; Jer 17:26; 4:4; 21:12; 23:2,22; 25:5; 26:3, 13; 44:22; Deut 28:20; 1 Kings 8:47; Zech 1:4; Ps 79:8; v. 34 // Deut 30:1-10; Lev 26:42-45; Jer 32:37; 24:6; 30:3; 11:5; Deut 1:8; 6:10; Jer 32:23; Deut 30:5,16; Jer 3:16; 23:3; Zech 10:8; Jer 24:6; 42:10; v. 35 // Jer 50:5; 32:40,38; 31:31-34.

<sup>44</sup> WATSON, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 461.

<sup>45</sup> WATSON, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 455.



law and do them.”<sup>46</sup> Although Watson is correct in connecting the Baruch passage to the wider set of deuteronomic curses, it is not apparent why Watson specifically associates Bar 1:19-21 only with Deut 27:26. True, curse language is found here; however, lexical similarities are lacking as there are two different terms used for curse, ἐπικατάρατος (Deut) and ἀρά (Bar).<sup>47</sup> Rather than advancing a specific passage, I would suggest that there are a number of parallels to Baruch from Deuteronomy 27 and 30, but also from other books in the Pentateuch, such as Lev 26.<sup>48</sup>

Watson is no doubt correct when he highlights deuteronomic influence; however, I would wish to emphasise the framework by which Baruch structures this “quotation”. In Deuteronomy the scattering of the people of Israel is a threat given by God as a promised response to future disobedience. The geographic location of this scattering in Deuteronomy, though, is vague, lacking specific details. In Baruch, however, this citation of Moses is explicitly placed in the Babylonian exile. Although acknowledging the fore-promises of God through Moses, Baruch in this section is viewing those future promises as presently realised through the Babylonian exile. This is reinforced by the allusions to Jeremiah identified above, in which this geographic deictic marker anchors the Baruch narrative in the Babylonian exile and provides the literary context by which to interpret the later narrative.

Another shortcoming of Watson’s otherwise insightful evaluation of Baruch is the lack of in-depth discussion of other, non-deuteronomic scriptural allusions. Although Watson is well aware of the parallels between Dan 9 and Bar 1:15-2:19 it is interesting that he downplays Daniel’s importance despite the fact that some of the literary and lexical similarities are stronger than the Deuteronomic ones. For example, there are a number of shared motifs between Daniel and Baruch, specifically: divine righteousness and human sinfulness (Bar 1:15-16; Dan 9:7-

<sup>46</sup> WATSON, Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith, 459.

<sup>47</sup> There are many other vocabulary similarities in this passage between Baruch and Jeremiah against Deuteronomy. For example, ἀποικισμοῦ (Bar 2:31) is a term for exile only found in Jeremiah and Baruch cf. Jer 50:11. Similarly, the root βομβ- is seen only in Bar 2:29 (βόμβησις); Jer 31:36; 38:36 and 1 Chron 16:32 (βομβέω). TOV, The Relation between the Greek Versions, 118. Though these are minor in importance, they do suggest a stronger literary relationship with Jeremiah than Deuteronomy.

<sup>48</sup> VEČHO, There is Hope for the Scattered People, 85. Večho identifies parallels with Lev 26:14-39 and Deut 28:15-29:1.

8); confession of sin (Bar 1: 17-18, 21; Dan 9:5-6); curses given by Moses (Bar 1:20; Dan 9:11, 13); destruction of the temple (Bar 2:2-3; Dan 9:12-13); remembering of the Exodus (Bar 2:11; Dan 9:15); appeal for a secession of divine anger (Bar 2:13; Dan 9:16); plea to be heard for God's sake (Bar 2:14; Dan 9:17); and prayer not based on one's own righteousness (Bar 2:19; Dan 9:18).<sup>49</sup> In Watson's defense, he is looking at the book of Baruch as a whole, not just the penitential prayer section and from this macro perspective Deuteronomy plays a more substantial role than Daniel.

More problematic, however, is Watson's lack of discussion of Jeremianic parallels. As shown above in the citations in the penitential prayer section, Baruch draws deeply from Jeremiah for its worldview.<sup>50</sup> Furthermore, Baruch portrays a particular relationship between Jeremiah and Deuteronomy; Deuteronomy or other books from the Pentateuch may be the specified referent, but it is to be understood through the lens of Jeremiah. In light of the strong relationship between Baruch and Jeremiah, it is surprising that mention of this affiliation is absent in Watson's study.

For example, though Watson discusses Baruch's three references to Moses (1:20; 2:2, 28), he overlooks the four references to the "prophets" (1:16, 21; 2:20, 24). It is this pairing of references that form the heart of the penitential prayer.<sup>51</sup> This is further confirmed by allusionary references to Jeremiah throughout the penitential prayer section. The very form of the passage, that of penitential prayer, reinforces the prophetic framework as this form of repentance is found almost exclusively in the prophetic literature.<sup>52</sup> These petitions, though grounded in a Deuteronomic worldview, are notably absent in practice outside of the prophet-

<sup>49</sup> Here the verbal similarities with Baruch are stronger with the Theodotian version of Daniel rather than the OG.

<sup>50</sup> Baruch is also highly influenced by the text of Jeremiah. In the first half of Baruch alone, Tov has identified thirty-two "important agreements between Bar and Jer-R". Although I disagree with the strength and wording of some of Tov's claims, the number of similarities between Baruch and LXX-Jeremiah is impressive and demands consideration. TOV, *Septuagint Translation*, 122-124.

<sup>51</sup> KABASELE MUKENGE, *Les Citations Internes en Ba. 1,15-3,8*, 215-216; FLOYD, *Penitential Prayer in the Second Temple Period*, 73.

<sup>52</sup> For example, Bar 2:6-10 bears similarities to the closing of other penitential prayers (e.g., Ezra 9:15; Neh 9:33; Dan 9:14; cf. also Ex 9:27; 2 Kgs 10:9; Ezek 18:9). VEČHO, *There is Hope for the Scattered People*, 87.

ic material and so any exegesis of this section must take into account that body of literature.

Although identifying allusions and parallel texts is important, it is insufficient—especially for Baruch—to merely state them without extrapolating on their significance. Unfortunately, a number of Baruchan scholars conclude their discussion at this point. If these are intentional allusions, one must ask about the intentionality of such connections. This is particularly relevant for Baruch which, as was seen above, draws on a number of scriptural texts. We turn now to understanding the function of Baruch's citations.

### The Function of Baruch's "Citations"

It has been well documented that Baruch makes extensive use of Scripture, especially the books of Deuteronomy, Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Psalms of Solomon. However, this appropriation of Jewish Scripture has often been seen as a dependence on previous narratives and lacking any form of creativity.<sup>53</sup> Furthermore, some have taken this as a claim that Baruch offers little unique theological or exegetical contribution.

Turning to the "quotations" in Baruch, we discover that the "quotations" rarely match a specific biblical text or a singular author, which can often offend the sensibilities of modern readers and scholars. However, rigid lexical precision was not slavishly adhered to by the ancients. In Timothy Lim's investigation of the use of Scripture in Paul and the Qumran community he shows that "in both ideological orientation and exegetical tradition, the persherists did not consider the words of their biblical texts to be fixed and immutable."<sup>54</sup> Rather, Lim contends that these authors not only saw themselves as commentators of Scripture, but also might have seen themselves as biblical writers.<sup>55</sup>

A. Kabasele Mukenge claims that one reason for the differences in cited texts by the author of Baruch is a result of quotation from memory

---

<sup>53</sup> So, Moore, Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah.

<sup>54</sup> LIM, *Holy Scripture*, 120.

<sup>55</sup> LIM, *Holy Scripture*, 120.

and not consulting the respective books.<sup>56</sup> Although this is likely the case for the author(s) of Baruch, this perspective does not do justice to all that we find in the text. It is insufficient to write off the differences as “authorial mistakes” and not to consider the holistic effect of the “misquotation”. This is especially so when approaching Baruch as it has a high number of allusions which assist in both shaping the text and assisting the reader in their interpretation.

As discussed above, there are a number of differences between the “quotations” in Baruch and their proposed source texts. Although I would agree with Kabasele Mukenge that it is unlikely that the author of Baruch had a roll of Jeremiah (or any other book) open before him, we must also appreciate, not only the changes from the source text, but also how they function in the book of Baruch.

First, the selection of specific texts is a creative act in itself. For example, Baruch could have selected any number of texts from Jeremiah, the Pentateuch, or the rest of Jewish Scripture, but rather he chose those that maintained a strong Jeremianic and deuteronomic perspective. This is seen in Bar 2:2 in which the “citation” from the Law of Moses has a near parallel in Jeremiah. Moreover, this Jeremiah parallel, though not explicitly referenced by the author, helps shape the interpretation of this passage by supporting the geographical location specified in Baruch and by providing a unified view of these verses’s prophetic fulfillment.

Second, the supposed “changes” or “mistakes” in Baruch’s citations need to be understood not solely in terms of carelessness or a free translation, but also as Baruch’s tailoring his source text to his current context. The combination of exposition and composition is what we see in these Baruch “quotations”. Here the author of Baruch composes a composite quotation from a number of biblical *excerpta* (cf. Luke 4:16-19)<sup>57</sup> in order to draw on a wide range of biblical texts and frame the deuteronomic promises through realized Jeremianic events.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> KABASELE MUKENGE, *Les Citations Internes en Ba.* 1,15-3,8, 213. Kabasele Mukenge explains the differences by also suggesting that the texts available to the writers of Baruch were different from the ‘*textus receptus*’.

<sup>57</sup> “Here again the technique of conflating and adapting a series of verses to suit a later author’s interpretive agenda finds a ready witness.” STANLEY, Paul and the Language of Scripture, 310. Stanley further claims that “omissions of irrelevant material,

This is not a re-written version of Scripture, as rewriting Scripture implies a closer relationship to a text than reframing. Rather, this is an example of “reframing” Scripture by resituating it within a new setting. By placing allusions and explicit references in a new or different context the author has the ability to subtly reshape the original material and message. For Baruch, this is not a rejection of the original context, as often the author is drawing on the background context in his or her message. Rather, the reframing of Scripture allows the author to recast the original message in a new and empowering way, one that is relevant for his current readers. In the case of Baruch, that way was to situate a deuteronomistic worldview within a Jeremianic frame.<sup>59</sup> This allows the author of Baruch to appropriate the message of Deuteronomy, but to cast it in a manner that acknowledges its exilic setting. Furthermore, it allows Baruch to take hold of deuteronomistic promises and claim them for his audience.

Helpful in this discussion, moreover, is the recognition of the type of text that these quotations occur in, namely, the penitential prayer section.<sup>60</sup> In this liturgical setting we have a group of people being led in a prayer as an act of repentance. The general thrust and function of the passage is to facilitate repentance by the Israelite people. In this case, there is a need to acknowledge that they have sinned by breaking the commandments given to them by Moses and the prophets, i.e., the whole of Jewish Scripture.<sup>61</sup> It would be insufficient to claim that they only disobeyed the words of Moses and Jeremiah, although this would be accurate. Rather, when it came to general repentance the author of Baruch, though drawing heavily from Jeremiah, did not wish to focus on Jeremiah alone, but indicate that the Jewish people had transgressed

---

condensing summaries, and additions designed to link the various selections into a coherent whole are the most visible forms of adaptation.”

<sup>58</sup> The citations are not the only deuteronomistic influence seen in Baruch. Another example can be seen in the near parallel of Bar 1:19 and Deut 9:7. MARTTILA, *Deuteronomistic Ideology and Phraseology in the Book of Baruch*, 324-325.

<sup>59</sup> STECK, *Das Apokryphe Baruchbuch*, 110.

<sup>60</sup> Although it is too much to discuss here, there is a strong scholarly discussion on the nature of penitential prayer in the Jewish Scriptures and the relationship between these passages. Of particular importance are the prayers of Deut 4:28-30 and 1 Kings 8:46-53, and their influence on the penitential prayers in Ezra 9; Neh 1; 9; Dan 9; and Bar 1:15-3:9. VEČHO, *There is Hope for the Scattered People*, 80. See also the three volumes of essays edited by BODA/FALK/WERLINE, *Seeking the Favor of God*.

<sup>61</sup> WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 137.

all the words of the prophets. The desire to indicate that the Jewish people had disobeyed all of the prophets, not just Jeremiah is the reason for the use of the plural prophets, rather than the use of the singular or specifying Jeremiah specifically.<sup>62</sup> This, I argue, is more convincing than the theory that the author of Baruch did not remember the book where these passages were taken.

### Conclusion

Much more work is needed in order to fully understand Baruch's use of Scripture. However, one way forward is consistent use terms. When dealing with texts that have a strong and complex relationship with Jewish Scriptures, such as Baruch, I believe we need much more precision in our use of terms. While finding synonyms is a standard procedure for making ones writing more interesting, we run the risk of diluting words that have particular meaning. For example, Watson, in discussing Baruch's relationship to Scripture, uses the terms "elaborates," "re-writes and expands," "amplifies," and "free paraphrase" all of which can be problematic in that he does not provide any boundaries to the relationship between the texts. Similarly, Lim rightly affirms that much more work needed before the relationship between a biblical text and its paraphrase is clarified.<sup>63</sup> Rather, these terms should only be used once they have been properly defined and delineated.

Turning to the text of Baruch, in light of the number of references and allusions to Jeremiah in this section it is imperative for interpreters to take into account possible Jeremianic associations in their

---

<sup>62</sup> Although I have not substantially discussed the literary relationship between Baruch and Daniel in this paper, the role of Daniel in the penitential prayer section is quite important. Though I have limited this article to explicit citations that meet Hock's first criterion, I do not wish to underplay the importance of Daniel. Like Jeremiah, Daniel is not referenced by name; however, his influence is seen throughout. As a result, I would argue that Baruch's use of "prophets", though not functioning on the rhetorical level of the quotations discussed above, readily includes Daniel as an important member of the prophetic chorus who had warned Israel in the past.

It should be noted, however, that reference to the person of Daniel in Baruch is understandably missing as its narrative is set in approximately 581BC and Daniel has not been born yet.

<sup>63</sup> LIM, Holy Scripture, 36.

interpretation. This is especially important when we attempt to interpret and evaluate the so-called “citations” in Baruch that refer to passages from the books of Moses. In these instances it is insufficient to only evaluate the Pentateuchal references. Rather, we see that these references to the Mosaic corpus are framed by and read through a Jeremianic lens. This understanding obligates future Baruch scholars to take seriously the creative and innovative constructions of Baruch and to understand the constructed relationships between Jeremiah and the Pentateuch, particularly Deuteronomy.

Finally, recognising the function of a text is important for interpreting how a text uses Scripture. In this article we have limited ourselves to Bar 1:15-3:8, or Baruch’s penitential prayer section. It is this liturgical setting, I have argued, that makes the most interpretive sense for understanding Baruch’s citations of Moses and the “prophets”. In this case, there was a need to acknowledge that the people had sinned by breaking the commandments given to them by both Moses and the prophets, or the whole of Jewish Scripture. The desire to indicate that the Jewish people had disobeyed all of the prophets, not just Jeremiah is the reason for the use of the plural prophets, rather than the use of the singular or specifying Jeremiah specifically. This, I argued, is the most convincing theory for Baruch’s use of the plural prophets.

Overall, this essay claims that, in its final form, Baruch displays an innovative and original reframing of Scripture to meet theological needs of the community. Accordingly, Baruch makes use of Scripture to frame the exile from Jerusalem to the Diaspora. But even more than this, Baruch uses Scripture to provide a theological understanding of the people’s place within God’s cosmos which allows them to come before God in an act of penitential prayer.

## Bibliography

- BARR, J. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, 15), Gottingen 1979.
- BODA, M.J./FALK, D.K./WERLINE, R.A. (eds.), *Seeking the Favor of God: Vol. 1, The Origins of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (EJL), Atlanta 2006.
- BODA, M.J./FALK, D.K./WERLINE, R.A. (eds.), *Seeking the Favor of God: Vol. 2, The Development of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (EJL), Atlanta 2007.
- BODA, M.J./FALK, D.K./WERLINE, R.A. (eds.), *Seeking the Favor of God: Vol. 3, The Impact of Penitential Prayer Beyond the Second Temple Judaism* (EJL), Atlanta 2008.
- BURKE, D.G. *The Poetry of Baruch: A Reconstruction and Analysis of the Original Hebrew Text of Baruch 3:9-5:9* (Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 10), Atlanta 1982.
- DAVIES, W.D./ALLISON, D.C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew, Vol. I* (ICC), London 1998.
- DAVILA, J.R. (How) Can We Tell if a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon has been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?, in: *JPS* 15 (2005) 3-61.
- FLOYD, M.H. Penitential Prayer in the Second Temple Period from the Perspective of Baruch, in: Boda, M.J./Falk, D.K./Werline, R.A. (eds.), *Seeking the Favor of God: Volume 2: The Development of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature 22), Atlanta 2007, 51-81.
- FOX, M.V. The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature, in: *ZAW* 92 (1980) 416-431.
- FRANCE, R.T. *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT), Grand Rapids 2007.
- GOLDSTEIN, J.A. The Apocryphal Book of 1 Baruch, in: *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 46-47 (1979-80) 179-199.
- HAMMILL, L.R. *Biblical Interpretation in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950.



- KABASELE MUKENGE, A. Les Citations Internes en *Ba.* 1,15-3,8: Un procédé rédactionnel et actualisant, in: *Le Muséon* 108 (1995) 211-37.
- KNEUCKER, J.J. Das Buch Baruch: Geschichte und Kritik, Übersetzung und Erklärung auf Grund des Wiederhergestellten Hebräischen Urtextes, Leipzig: 1879.
- KOCH, D.-A. Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus (BHT 69), Tübingen 1986.
- LIM, T.H. Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters, Oxford 1997.
- LUZ, U. Matthew 1-7: A Commentary (Hermeneia), Minneapolis 2007.
- MARTILA, M. Deuteronomistic Ideology and Phraseology in the Book of Baruch, in: von Weissenberg, H./Pakkala, J./Marttila, M. (eds.), *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Tradition in the Second Temple Period* (BZAW 419), Berlin 2011, 321-346.
- MOORE, C.A. Towards the Dating of the Book of Baruch, in: *CBQ* 36 (1974) 312-320.
- MOORE, C.A. Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: The Additions: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 44), London 1977.
- MYERS, J.M. I and II Esdras: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 42), New Haven 1995.
- MYERS, J.M. Ezra, Nehemiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 14), New Haven 1995.
- SCHULTZ, R.L. The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets (JSOTS 180), Sheffield 1999.
- STANLEY, C.D. Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature (SNTSMS 74), Cambridge 1992.
- STECK, O.H. Das Apokryphe Baruchbuch: Studien zu Rezeption und Konzentration "kanonischer" Überlieferung (FRLANT 160), Göttingen 1993.
- TORRY, C.C. The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction, New Haven 1945.
- TOV, E. The Book of Baruch (Text and Translations 8; Pseudepigrapha Series 6), Missoula 1975.

- TOV, E. The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8 (Harvard Semitic Monographs 8), Missoula 1976.
- TOV, E. The Relation between the Greek Versions of Baruch and Daniel, in: Stone, M.E. (ed.), *Armenian and Biblical Studies*, Jerusalem, 1976, 27-34.
- VEČHO, T.S. There is Hope for the Scattered People (Bar 1:15aβ-3:8), in: *BV* 67 (2007) 73-97.
- WAMBACQ, B.N. "Les Prières de Baruch (1,15-2,19) et de Daniel (9,5-19), in: *Biblica* 40 (1959) 463-475.
- WATSON, F. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, London 2004.
- WERLINE, R.A. *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution* (SBL Early Judaism and its Literature 13) Atlanta 1998.
- WHITEHOUSE, O.C. The Book of Baruch, in: Charles, R.H. (ed.), *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, Vol. 1. Oxford 1913, 569-595.
- WILLIAMSON, H.G.M. *Ezra, Nehemiah* (WBC 16), Waco, TX 1985.
- ZIEGLER, J. *Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae*. Volume XV. *Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*. Göttingen 32006 [1957].
- ZINK, J.K. *The Use of the Old Testament in the Apocrypha*, Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1963.